

Date: Sun, 8 May 94 04:30:09 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #196  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 8 May 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 196

Today's Topics:

Gilder's Concerns

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Fri, 6 May 1994 18:56:17 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!  
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Gilder's Concerns  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <CpCCo0.EKn@calvin.edu> mmcdon46@ursa.calvin.edu (Michael McDonald) writes:

>Gilder has certainly raised some very important questions--and I wonder  
>what the FCC has in mind for the HF bands. Additionally, if the  
>Steinbrecher radios are operating on principles that are far beyond  
>traditional RF theory, does the Amateur Radio community have any kind of a  
>future, or do we simply hold on to these outdated notions of exclusivity  
>of frequencies? It seems the Amateur community is indeed stuck in the  
>analog mode and will not be coming out soon. These technological leaps  
>transcend the notions of a set of frequencies that Amateurs can call their  
>own.

>Will there be any discussion of these questions when the ITU treaty comes  
>up for renewal in the next few years? What will our beloved FCC establish  
>as a negotiating position re amateur exclusivity in HF? Will the ARRL and

>other Amateur groups have to bid to hold on to this seemingly outmoded  
>idea of exclusive frequencies? Will the 20m band actually sound civilized  
>again?

The day will soon come when USER SELECTABLE direct sequence spread spectrum hopping sequences are available to all. If we go beyond that to Steinbrecher's "adaptive" very wide band approach, frequency coordination and spectrum allocation problems are no longer a concern. Couple this with truly secure digital encryption (NOT Bill Clintons Clipper Crapola) and you have what the airwave were meant to be: totally free and secure communication for anyone who wants to use them. Such an idea really pisses off Big Brother. The government alone will be the limiting factor.

BTW, we no longer need amateur radio anymore either.  
73, roger roger, QRT, over and out!

```
--  
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com  
{      }/    Marquette Electronics, Inc  
 \      /    N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio  
 |__*|    N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```

-----  
Date: 5 May 1994 13:08:35 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!portal.gmu.edu!fame.gmu.edu!smasters@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <phb.767540105@melpar>, <ddtodd.63.0016E34F@ucdavis.edu>,  
<phb.768060210@melpar>s  
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

If the dealers have to be responsible for what they sell who, then does that mean Circuit City can't sell me parts that I can use to build a device that breaks the law? The line where such responsibility are seems quite arbitrary. Especially when one considers how easy it is to build something like a spark gap. Should we ban those parts from sale:-)?

73,  
Shawn  
KE4GHS

--  
Shawn C. Masters

smasters@gmu.edu

I speak for myself, not my department or institution.

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #196

\*\*\*\*\*